

ogist Lynn Miller expressed a feeling seemingly widely shared among Hampshire science faculty that "If we identify a group of students who want professional training, then it is incumbent on us to design their education for preprofessional preparation."

Hampshire seems to stand in no danger of not attracting qualified students. There were more than 2000 applicants for the 250 places available this year, and the ratio will be higher next year as the word on Hampshire gets around.

A main question confronting Hampshire, however, is whether the special favor of private benefactors and private foundations will make Hampshire simply another small private college which will attract carefully selected, suburban middle-class, low-risk, high achievers. In other words, will a Hampshire education be a further privilege for the already privileged?

Given the good intentions behind Hampshire, this is a rude question and one that probably would not have been asked at all in 1958. But this is 1970. The question must have been in the minds of the foundation officers and federal officials who gave Hampshire

its remarkable financial send-off. And it makes Hampshire's silver spoon a special burden.

Talks with administrators and faculty at Hampshire reveal that they are certainly aware of the problem. One admissions officer stated it directly when he said, "We try to avoid a 'Hampshire type.' If we take only highly motivated kids we haven't proved anything."

The first entering class seems by and large a fairly high-powered lot. Faculty members find them astonishingly experienced in community-service and social-action activities. As one professor put it, "They're a pretty entrepreneurial group."

Not surprisingly, the young people who heard about Hampshire and applied for admission tended to come from what are regarded as good schools. The first group splits roughly 50-50 between private and public school products, and one faculty member estimates that 40 to 60 percent of them have had experience with tutorials or other forms of independent study.

Like all private institutions, Hampshire worries about pricing itself out of the general market. The cost of tu-

ition, room, and board this year is \$3800, and the trend everywhere is up. Some \$120,000 has been earmarked for scholarship aid at Hampshire this year, and about a quarter of the students receive help in varying degrees. Hampshire is working hard on the problem of achieving heterogeneity but its commitment to covering costs essentially out of tuition creates a special bind. The Hampshire experiment is intended to benefit undergraduate education at large, but inevitably it will have to be judged according to its admissions pattern as well as its balance sheet.

Hampshire started with the advantages of a superb physical setting and intelligent planning. In its early days, students, faculty, and administrators seem to share a sense of enterprise and community which is refreshing to encounter at a time when things are otherwise on many campuses. There is also a healthy strain of realism operating at Hampshire—and so it may not be churlish to quote the science faculty member who said starting a college is "like marriage. First euphoria, then a letdown. The question is what happens in steady state."—JOHN WALSH

Campaign GM: A New Pitch to University Shareholders

The opening of the second round in the "Campaign to Make General Motors Responsible," which created at least a mild stir on a number of university campuses this past spring, was announced in Washington last week. The campaign's immediate objectives have been redefined in a way calculated to attract greater support from GM's institutional shareholders.

In one of their two principal proposals last spring the young "public-interest" lawyers running the campaign called for the election of a Negro leader, a consumer representative, and an environmentalist to GM's board of directors. In their other proposal they sought to have GM establish a committee on corporate responsibility which the campaign leaders and the United Auto Workers would have helped to select. The company argued, with good reason, that the effect of these proposals would be to inject into decision-

making at GM persons who had little or no investment in the company and no direct interest in its financial success.

Campaign GM's three current proposals cannot be so easily dismissed on those grounds. These proposals would:

- Require GM to list on its proxy statement those candidates for the board of directors nominated by shareholders at large as well as those nominated by management. Shareholders, nearly all of whom must vote by proxy if they are to vote at all, no longer would be presented with a single slate of candidates, in the manner of elections in the People's Republics.

- Permit GM's three "constituencies"—its employees, consumers, and dealers—each to nominate a candidate for the board of directors. Consumers are defined as persons whose ownership of new GM cars, buses, and

trucks is on record with the company.

- Require GM to publish in its annual report detailed information as to the company's progress in minority hiring, auto safety, and development of nonpolluting vehicles. Certain specific information could be omitted if disclosure would put the company at a competitive disadvantage.

Leaders of Campaign GM have asked that the proposal on disclosure and the "corporate democracy" proposal on abolishing single-slate elections be adopted by the board of directors immediately—merely as guarantees of existing shareholder rights. Short of this, GM is asked to include these proposals on the proxy statement which stockholders will receive prior to the annual meeting next May. Action on the "constituent democracy" proposal, which is acknowledged to be a new departure, should await the shareholders' meeting, campaign leaders have told GM.

If the GM management should act favorably on any or all of these proposals—and this seems most unlikely—it will not be for fear of being outvoted. The Campaign GM proposals of last May got less than 3 percent of the

votes, and it will be surprising if the new proposals receive a substantially higher percentage. The real aim of the campaign, however, is not to win proxy fights but to influence public opinion—especially by obtaining support from prestigious institutional shareholders such as Harvard, M.I.T., Yale, Columbia, and Stanford. None of these institutions actually endorsed Campaign GM's last proposals, but several institutions sent letters to General Motors urging greater attention to "corporate responsibility" issues such as air pollution and traffic safety.

Also, some major institutions, including Harvard and Columbia, undertook studies of their relations with corporate enterprise. At Harvard, Robert W. Austin of the Business School is heading such an inquiry, a study described by President Nathan M. Pusey as comparable to Harvard's 1961 study of its relations with the federal government. Moreover, students and faculty at business schools at Harvard, Stanford, the University of Pennsylvania, and other institutions have become increasingly concerned with questions of corporate responsibility. Leaders of Campaign GM find this to be encouraging. "I don't expect to see the 'greening' of James Roche [GM's board chairman]," says Joseph N. Onek, one of the campaign coordinators. "But I do expect to see the greening of some James Roches of the future."

As the world's largest corporation, GM makes a symbolic target for the corporate responsibility movement and the company finds itself under growing pressure. This was evident last August when GM announced that it was establishing a new public policy committee, although the persons appointed to this committee—made up of five members of the board of directors—included no outsiders who might make trouble.

The possibility now arises that General Motors and other large companies will in time be required by law to govern themselves more democratically. In June, Senator Edmund S. Muskie of Maine, the front-runner for the Democratic nomination for President in 1972, introduced a measure called the "Corporate Participation Act." As now drafted, the bill may deal with a moot question, for it is concerned with situations of the kind that arose in a case decided in July by the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

In that case, the Medical Committee for Human Rights sued the Securi-

ties and Exchange Commission (SEC) demanding that Dow Chemical Company be required to include in its proxy statement a proposal for the company to stop manufacturing napalm. The SEC, which last spring also had allowed General Motors to omit several Campaign GM proposals from its proxy statement, apparently had accepted Dow's argument that the napalm proposal was one promoted simply for "general political and social reasons." The court, however, ruled in the Medical Committee's favor and observed: ". . . there is a clear and compelling distinction between management's legitimate need for freedom to apply its expertise in matters of day-to-day business judgment, and management's patently illegitimate claim of powers to treat modern corporations with their vast resources as personal satrapies implementing political or moral predilections."

Muskie's staff is now considering what new steps might be appropriate to expand the concept of corporate participation. In this regard, the latest Campaign GM formulations are to receive careful attention.

—LUTHER J. CARTER

APPOINTMENTS

DeWitt Stetten, Jr., dean, Rutgers Medical School, to director, National Institute of General Medical Sciences, NIH. . . . **Dexter S. Goldman**, Veterans Administration associate professor, Institute for Enzyme Research, University of Wisconsin, Madison, to director, Institute for Biology, Haifa University, Israel. . . . **Athelstan F. Spilhaus, Jr.**, assistant executive director, American Geophysical Union, appointed executive director. . . . **Robert F. Carbone**, special assistant to the president, University of Wisconsin, to dean, University of Maryland's College of Education. . . . **Donald Schwartz**, associate dean, Graduate School, Memphis State University, to dean for advanced studies, Florida Atlantic University. . . . **Harold Mazur**, interim chairman, community medicine and public health department, University of Southern California School of Medicine, appointed chairman. . . . **William H. Marlow**, director, Institute for Management Science and Engineering, George Washington University, to chairman, engineering administration and operations research department, School of Engi-

neering and Applied Science at the university. . . . **Richard T. Loutitt**, chief, behavioral science research branch, National Institute of Mental Health, NIH, to chairman, psychology department, University of Massachusetts. . . . **Arnold Court**, professor of climatology, San Fernando Valley State College, to chairman, geography department at the college. . . . **Edwin T. Hibbs**, professor of zoology and entomology, Iowa State University, to head, biology department, Georgia Southern College. . . . **John O. Corliss**, director, program in systematic biology, National Science Foundation, to head, zoology department, University of Maryland. . . . **Ormond G. Mitchell**, associate professor of anatomy, College of Dentistry, New York University, to chairman, biology department, Adelphi University. . . . **Jerome S. Tobis**, formerly chairman, physical medicine department, New York Medical College, to chairman, physical medicine and rehabilitation department, College of Medicine, University of California, Irvine. . . . **Joseph C. Ross**, professor of medicine, Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, to chairman, medicine department, Medical University of South Carolina. . . . **Leonard J. Greenfield**, associate dean, Graduate School, University of Miami, to chairman, biology department at the university. . . . **C. E. Miller**, professor of botany, Ohio University, to chairman, botany department at the university.

RECENT DEATHS

Watson S. Rankin, 91; former dean, Wake Forest College of Medicine; 8 September.

Howard Selsam, 67; former director, Jefferson School of Social Science; 7 September.

John W. Stafford, 62; former chairman, psychology department, Catholic University; 8 September.

Howard G. Swann, 64; professor of physiology, University of Texas Medical Branch; 14 September.

David W. Varley, 48; professor of sociology, University of Arizona; 14 September.

Simon J. Vellenga, 64; professor of chemistry, Muskingum College; 3 August.

Leva B. Walker, 91; professor emeritus of botany, University of Nebraska; 29 July.